

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance because the claims are non-obvious and patentable over the cited references. The following paragraphs provide the justification for this belief. In view of the following reasoning for allowance, the Applicant hereby respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the subject patent application.

1.0 Indications of Allowable Subject Matter:

The Final Office Action of May 26, 2004, indicated that claims 11, 12, 23-27, 30-32 and 38-43 contained subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim, and any intervening claims. While the Applicant disagrees with the rejections advanced in the final Office Action for the reasons set forth in the Applicants previous response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, and 34 to include the allowable subject matter indicated in the Final Office Action so as to further prosecution of the present patent application.

In particular, the Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the allowable limitations of dependent claims 8, 10, and 12, since claim 12 depended from claim 10, which in turn depended from claim 8, which in turn depended from claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, now includes allowable subject matter, in accordance with the Office Action. Consequently, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is no longer proper. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 and thus of dependent claims 2-7, 9, 11 and 13-14.

Similarly, the Applicant has amended independent claim 15 to include the allowable limitations of dependent claims 21-23, since claim 23 depended from claim 22, which in turn depended from claim 21, which in turn depended from claim 15. Therefore, claim 15, as amended, now includes allowable subject matter, in accordance with the Office Action. Consequently, the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is no longer proper.


Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 15 and thus of dependent claims 16-20 and 24-33.

Finally, the Applicant has amended independent claim 34 to include the allowable limitations of dependent claims 35-38, since claim 38 depended from claim 37, which in turn depended from claim 36, which in turn depended from claim 35, which in turn depended from claim 34. Therefore, claim 34, as amended, now includes allowable subject matter, in accordance with the Office Action. Consequently, the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is no longer proper. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 34 and thus of dependent claims 39-43.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13, 14-20, 24-34, and 39-43 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 11, 13, 14-20, 24-34, and 39-43, and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,



Lyon & Harr
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, California 93036
(805) 278-8855

Mark A. Watson
Registration No. 41,370
Attorney for Applicant